



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,709	01/05/2004	Terrence M. Parve	028757-0142	2265

26371 7590 03/16/2005

FOLEY & LARDNER
777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 3800
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308

EXAMINER

NICOLAS, FREDERICK C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3754

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

GN

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/751,709	Applicant(s) PARVE ET AL.	
	Examiner Frederick C. Nicolas	Art Unit 3754	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartilson et al. 3,499,588 in view of in view of Bartilson 3,563,426.

Bartilson et al. disclose a closure (10) for a container (12), which comprises a base including at least one opening (46) for dispensing a material from the container, a top portion (14) coupled to the base having at least one flap (20) movable about a hinge (22) between an open position for dispensing the material and a closed position for covering the opening (col. 4, ll. 16-60), a first elongate recess (16) and a second elongate recess (col. 4, ll. 16-25). A first projection (40) extending from a first side of the flap, a second projection (38) extending from a second side of the flap, so that the first projection is configured to fit at least partially within the first elongate recess and the second projection is configured to fit at least partially within the second elongate recess when the flap is in the closed position (col. 4, ll. 61-67), a spooning flap (col. 4, ll. 26-34). Bartilson et al. lack that an interface extending from the flap. Bartilson teaches the use of a flap (66) having an interface (62) extending from the flap as seen in Figure 7.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the closure of Bartilson et al. including the base by

Art Unit: 3754

providing Bartilson's interface onto the flap as taught by Bartilson in (col. 5, ll. 1-45), in order to provide an additional means for releasably securing the flap/cover in the closed position.

3. Claims 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartilson et al. 3,499,588 in view of in view of Bartilson 3,563,426 as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Waterman 3,262,606.

Bartilson et al-Bartilson in combination have taught all the features of the claimed invention except that a third projection extending downward from a free end of the flap. Waterman teaches the use of a first, second and third projections (25) from a flap (14), where the first and second projection are interconnected by the third projection as seen in Figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Waterman's teaching onto the flap of Bartilson et al. and Bartilson by adding a third projection as taught by Waterman in Figure 1 and (col. 3, ll. 1-73), in order to provide a peripheral skirt around the cover flap.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-32 are allowed.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art fails to disclose or render obvious in an integrally-formed cover for a container in combination with the other claimed limitations of claim 1:

"the projection extending from the shaker flap comprises a tab; and a guide provided with the tab so that movement of the shaker flap from the open position to the

Art Unit: 3754

closed position initially brings the guide into wedging interaction with an inner edge of the shaker opening and further movement of the shaker flap brings the tab into wedging interaction with the inner edge of the shaker opening; so that the shaker flap is retained in the closed position by the wedging interaction of the tab against the inner edge of the shaker opening”.

The prior art fails to disclose or render obvious in a closure for a container in combination with the other claimed limitations of claim 11:

“a guide extending from the projection; and a guide surface provided on the guide and configured to contact an edge of the opening when the flap is moved toward the closed position and configured to create a wedging interaction with the edge of the opening when the flap is moved further toward the closed position; so that the flap is retained in the closed position by the wedging interaction of the projection and the edge”.

Further, the prior art fails to disclose or render obvious in a closure for a container in combination with the other claimed limitations of claim 23:

“a second projection extending from the first projection; and a guide surface provided on the second projection and configured to contact a portion of the base adjacent the opening when the flap is moved toward the closed position and configured to create a wedging interaction with the portion of the base adjacent the opening when the flap is moved further toward the closed position; so that the flap is retained in the closed position by the wedging interaction of at least one of the first projection and the second projection with the portion of the base adjacent the opening”.

Art Unit: 3754

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 9/9/2004 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frederick C. Nicolas whose telephone number is (571)-272-4931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 3754

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Y Mar, can be reached on 571-272-4906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FN
March 15, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'F. Nicolas', followed by the date '3/15/05' written in a similar cursive style.

Frederick C. Nicolas
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3754